

1 Ryan E. Hatch (SBN 235577)
rhatch@linerlaw.com
2 Jason L. Haas (SBN 217290)
jhaas@linerlaw.com
3 LINER LLP
1100 Glendon Avenue, 14th Floor
4 Los Angeles, California 90024.3518
Telephone: (310) 500-3500
5 Facsimile: (310) 500-3501

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff SIGNAL IP, INC.

7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 SIGNAL IP, INC., a California
11 corporation,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 AMERICAN HONDA MOTOR CO.,
INC., a California corporation;
15 HONDA OF AMERICA MFG, INC.,
an Ohio corporation,

16 Defendant.

Case No. 2:14-cv-02454-JAK (JEMx)
(Related to 2:14-cv-02962-JAK
(JEMx); SA CV14-00497-JAK (JEMx);
8:14-cv-00491-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-
02963 JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-02457-
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03111-JAK
(JEMx); LA CV14-03109 JAK (JEMx);
2:14-cv-03107-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-
03113-JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03108-
JAK (JEMx); 2:14-cv-03114-JAK
(JEMx))

17 **JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION**
BRIEF

18 AND RELATED CASES

Date: March 31, 2015
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Crtrm.: 750

The Hon. John A. Kronstadt

Trial Date: TBD

VWGoA - Ex. 1008
Volkswagen Group of America, Inc., Petitioner
Signal IP, Inc., Patent Owner

LINER LLP
1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90024.3518

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2 I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
3 II. LEGAL STANDARDS.....	2
4 A. Defendants’ Statement.....	2
5 B. Signal’s Statement.....	3
6 III. DISCUSSION.....	5
7 A. Defendants’ Statement on Indefiniteness.....	5
8 B. VWGOA and Bentley’s Statement – Extrinsic Evidence is Not 9 Required to Prove Indefiniteness	6
10 C. Signal’s Statement.....	9
11 1. Defendants Failed to Meet Their Burden of Proof to Show 12 Indefiniteness.....	9
13 D. ‘927 Patent	13
14 Defendants’ Summary of ‘927 Patent	13
15 1. Preamble (Claim 1).....	16
16 (a) Defendants’ Statement	16
17 (b) Honda’s Statement	17
18 (c) Signal’s Statement.....	18
19 2. “Variable sustain time” (Claims 1 and 2).....	18
20 (a) Defendants’ Statement	18
21 (b) Signal’s Statement.....	24
22 3. “Wherein the zone of coverage appears to increase 23 according to the variable sustain time” (Claim 1).....	25
24 (a) Defendants’ Statement	25
25 (b) VWGoA and Bentley’s Separate Statement	31
26 (c) Honda’s Alternative Construction.....	32
27 (d) Signal’s Statement.....	34
28 4. “A threshold time” (Claim 1)	40
(a) Defendants’ Statement	40

LINER LLP
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

LINER LLP
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 44

5. “Improving the perceived zone of coverage” (Claim 1) 45

(a) Defendants’ Statement 45

(b) VWGoA and Bentley’s Separate Statement 47

(c) Signal’s Statement..... 48

E. ‘375 Patent 49

Defendants’ Summary of ‘375 Patent 49

6. “Force distribution” (Claim 1)..... 51

(a) Defendants’ Statement 51

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 53

7. “On the passenger seat” (Claim 1) 55

(a) Defendants’ Statement 55

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 58

8. “Seat area” (Claim 1)..... 60

(a) Defendants’ Statement 60

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 64

9. “Sensor array” / “Array of force sensors” (Claim 1)..... 66

(a) Defendants’ Statement 66

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 69

10. “Seat area threshold force” (Claim 1)..... 71

(a) Defendants’ Statement 72

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 74

11. “Concentrated” (Claim 1)..... 75

(a) Defendants’ Statement 75

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 78

F. ‘007 Patent 80

Defendants’ Summary of the ‘007 Patent 80

12. “Seat sensors” (Claims 1, 17, 18 & 19)..... 80

LINER LLP
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

(a) Defendants’ Statement 80

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 83

13. “Lock flag” / “Flag” (Claims 1 & 17) 84

(a) Defendants’ Statement 85

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 87

14. “For a time” / “For a given time” (Claims 1 & 17)..... 88

(a) Defendants’ Statement 88

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 91

15. “A second threshold” (Claim 20) 92

(a) Defendants’ Statement 93

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 94

16. “Relative weight parameter” (Claims 1, 17, 20-22)..... 95

(a) Defendants’ Statement 96

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 99

17. “Setting” / “Set a lock flag when...” (Claims 1, 17)..... 100

(a) Defendants’ Statement 101

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 103

18. “A level indicative of an empty seat” (Claims 1, 17)..... 104

(a) Defendants’ Statement 104

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 106

19. “Arrayed in an interface defined by the bottom surface”
 (Claim 19)..... 109

(a) Defendants’ Statement 110

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 112

20. “Means for selectively allowing deployment according to
 the outputs of seat sensors responding to the weight of an
 occupant” (Claim 1)..... 113

(a) Defendants’ Statement 114

(b) Signal’s Statement..... 117

LINER LLP
 1100 Glendon Avenue | 14th Floor
 Los Angeles, CA 90024-3518

1	(i)	Legal Standard for Means-Plus-Function Analysis.....	117
2	(ii)	The Limitations Are Not in Means-Plus-Function Format Because a POSA Would Identify Structure in the Claims	118
3	(iii)	Defendants’ Arguments Fail Because they Provide No Evidence from a POSA.....	120
4	(iv)	If the Claims are in Means-Plus-Function Format, then the Corresponding Structure is the Microprocessor.....	121
5			
6			
7			
8	21.	“Means for inhibiting and allowing deployment according to whether a seat is occupied by a person of at least a minimum weight” (Claim 17).....	124
9			
10	(a)	Defendants’ Statement	125
11	(b)	Signal’s Statement.....	127
12	G.	‘486 Patent	128
13		Defendants’ Summary of the ‘486 Patent	128
14	22.	“Desired warning distance based upon the current steering angle” / “Desired Warning Distance” (Claims 21 and 28).....	129
15	(a)	Defendants’ Statement	129
16	(b)	Honda’s Position	132
17	(c)	BMWNA’s Position on “desired warning distance”.....	133
18	(d)	Signal’s Statement.....	135
19	(i)	The Warning Distance Need Not Always “Vary” Depending On the Current Steering Angle	135
20	(ii)	Not All Objects Within the Warning Distance Will Result in an Alarm	137
21	(iii)	There is No Basis for Requiring the Distance to be “Defined”	138
22			
23			
24	H.	‘601 Patent	138
25		Defendants’ Summary of the ‘601 Patent	138
26	23.	“During conditions when...” (Claims 8 and 15)	139
27	(a)	Defendants’ Statement	139
28			

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.